



# Mark Scheme

Summer 2017

Pearson Edexcel  
GCE In History (9HI02) Paper 2B  
Advanced

Unit 2: Depth study

Option 2B.1: Luther and the German Reformation,  
c1515-1555

Option 2B.2: The Dutch Revolt, c1563-1609

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk). Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2017

Publications Code 9H10\_2B\_1706\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

## General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.
- Mark schemes will indicate within the table where, and which strands of QWC, are being assessed. The strands are as follows:

*i) ensure that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate so that meaning is clear*

*ii) select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter*

*iii) organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.*

## Generic Level Descriptors: Section A

**Target:** AO2: Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.</li><li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the source material.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little or no supporting evidence. Concepts of reliability or utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4–7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the source material by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question.</li><li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concepts of reliability or utility are addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>8–12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences.</li><li>• Deploys knowledge of the historical context to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of utility takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria but with limited justification.</li></ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>13–16</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion, although treatment of the two sources may be uneven.</li><li>• Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may be weakly substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.</li></ul>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="402 197 1362 310">• Interrogates the evidence of both sources with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion.</li><li data-bbox="402 321 1362 468">• Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/ or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying secure understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.</li><li data-bbox="402 478 1362 619">• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement and, where appropriate, distinguishes between the degree of certainty with which aspects of it can be used as the basis for claims.</li></ul>

## Section B

**Target:** AO1: Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li> <li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li> <li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li> <li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is limited analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.</li> <li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> <li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li> </ul>
3	8–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li> <li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.</li> <li>• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement.</li> </ul>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="402 195 1279 249">• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.</li></ul>

## Section A: indicative content

### Option 2B.1: Luther and the German Reformation, c1515-1555

Question	Indicative content
1	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to shed light on the reasons for the failure of Charles V to destroy Lutheranism in Germany.</p> <p><b>Source 1</b></p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It was produced shortly after Charles' major victory in the Schmalkaldic War when it appeared that he was on the brink of total victory</li><li>• It was written in Magdeburg, one of the few cities not to fall to Charles in 1547, at a time when it was besieged by forces loyal to the Emperor – it can therefore be seen as a demonstration of faith and defiance</li><li>• Addressed openly to Charles, it may be seen as seeking to rally the Protestant cause across Germany in its hour of greatest peril.</li></ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the reasons for Charles failure to destroy Lutheranism in Germany:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The source indicates that there is still considerable opposition to Charles in Germany even 3 years after his victory in the Schmalkaldic War</li><li>• It demonstrates deeply-held religious justification for continued resistance to Charles ('Christ...rebel...has shown us', 'name of Scripture') and argues that there are clear limitations to his power ('sphere...kingdom of God')</li><li>• The source may imply that Charles is far from destroying the determination of Lutherans to maintain their faith ('unjust war', 'he may be resisted') and that his authority over them relies on 'military force'.</li></ul> <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Charles' victory came 30 years after Luther's initial protest during which time protestant beliefs had taken deep root</li><li>• His allies included a number of Protestant princes induced by political promises and achieved victory largely thanks to a temporary lull in his commitments outside Germany – neither was likely to, nor did, last</li><li>• The League revived with French support in 1552 and Charles was forced to concede the Peace of Passau – religious toleration became permanent in 1555.</li></ul> <p><b>Source 2</b></p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The speech, right at the end of Charles' public career in 1556, is after he'd been forced to concede freedom of worship to Lutherans at Augsburg and a theme of regret runs through it</li><li>• As a public speech it may seek to justify his failures, some of which he acknowledges here</li></ul>



Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Because it is his final public act and no longer needs to be diplomatic, he may also express some of his truest feelings on important matters.</li> </ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the reasons for Charles's failure to destroy Lutheranism in Germany:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It identifies foreign intervention as a cause of Charles' failure ('hostility and envy...neighbouring princes')</li> <li>• It identifies Charles' age and also possibly his illness as having compromised his campaigns ('no longer able...great bodily fatigue') and that this may have been the case for some time ('last time...I had decided to abdicate')</li> <li>• The source implies that a cause of Charles' failure is the lack of backing he received from secular rulers in Germany as he reminds the nobility of the need to 'grant to authority the support it needs'.</li> </ul> <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Charles did not take military action against Protestantism in Germany until 1546, 25 years after denouncing Luther at Worms – this delay could be seen as fatal</li> <li>• His opposition to Lutheranism had been interrupted by his many commitments outside Germany, notably the on-going wars against France and the Ottomans who often worked in collusion against him</li> <li>• The intervention of Henri II in helping to re-found the Schmalkaldic League and invading Metz, Toul and Verdun contributed heavily to Charles' decision to abdicate</li> <li>• By the time of this speech, Charles was 56, had spent much of his adult life travelling and at war, and was suffering badly from gout.</li> </ul> <p><b>Sources 1 and 2</b></p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They both come from the last years of his reign, shortly before and just after the Peace of Augsburg in 1555</li> <li>• The sources together identify the range and weight of problems facing Charles in attempting to impose Catholicism in the Empire despite his victory in 1547</li> <li>• They both raise the issue of obedience to higher political authority, Charles in Source 2 pleading that it be respected and Source 1 in justifying withholding it in the interests of true religion.</li> </ul>

**Option 2B.2: The Dutch Revolt, c1563-1609**

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to shed light on the reasons for continuing opposition to Philip II's rule in the Netherlands in the 1580s.</p> <p><b>Source 3</b></p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As an Edict of the States-General, it may be considered that this has significant support in the Netherlands</li><li>• The tone and language of the Edict demonstrate the strength of opposition to Spanish rule which had developed by the 1580s</li><li>• There is no indication here of any arguments used to the contrary or the size of any minority view in the Netherlands.</li></ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the reasons for continuation of opposition to Philip II's rule:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It condemns Spanish rule for attempts to rule the Netherlands by force ('rule us absolutely', 'tyrannise us', 'bring us into slavery')</li><li>• It indicates that Philip's authority was dependent on maintaining the traditions which he promised to protect at his coronation ('according to the conditions ...sworn on oath to maintain') but that he has broken</li><li>• It indicates that blame lies with advisors rather than the king himself ('put his trust...Council of Spain', 'advised...conquered these territories') though this may be a device for avoiding direct criticism of Philip.</li></ul> <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Philip II had created opposition from the start of his reign by his contempt for the traditional customs and rights enjoyed by the 17 provinces</li><li>• Though there was considerable support in the southern provinces for Spanish rule, concern for ancient practices was widely shared</li><li>• The recent successes of Parma allowed Orange and other opponents of Spanish rule to rally opposition around support for traditional customs and traditions</li><li>• Despite their agreement indicated in the source, the provinces remained deeply divided on other matters, notably religion and distrust of Anjou – as a result the Act failed to unite them permanently against Philip.</li></ul> <p><b>Source 4</b></p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The source is the opinion of one person and there is no indication of how widely his views were shared in the Netherlands</li><li>• As it was written by the Town Clerk of Amsterdam in the province of Holland we can expect it to be hostile to Spanish rule, Holland having been in rebellion since 1572</li></ul>

Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was written in 1586 at a time when the future of the United Provinces remained perilous and may be read therefore, as a justification for continued rebellion.</li> </ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the reasons for the continuation of opposition to Philip II's rule:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It accuses Philip of having a design to rob the provinces of their ancient customs ('deprive them...privileges and rights')</li> <li>• It indicates that there were good grounds to oppose Philip because he had broken the promises made at his coronation ('contrary...oath he's sworn', 'exceeding his power')</li> <li>• It states that in the event of a king acting tyrannically ('evil plans, bad government') all political leaders have a duty to organise resistance ('stand up against it') or be similarly condemned ('as guilty...traitors').</li> </ul> <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 1586, following years of Spanish gains and the death of Orange, the future of the United Provinces looked bleak</li> <li>• The Treaty of Nonsuch offered crucial English support but the rebellious provinces were divided over aims and tactics and thus, vulnerable to defeat</li> <li>• It was only later that greater co-ordination of decision-making was achieved in the United Provinces thanks to the work of Maurice and Oldenbarnevelt</li> <li>• Holland, from where Coornhert originates (and of which Oldenbarnevelt was Advocate and Maurice was Stadtholder), was key to the subsequent victory of the United Provinces thanks to its burgeoning wealth and confidence.</li> </ul> <p><b>Sources 3 and 4</b></p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both sources emphasise the disastrous consequences of Spanish rule for traditional forms of government in the Netherlands and call for resistance to Philip on political, rather than religious, grounds</li> <li>• Source 1 suggests wider support for resistance as it was passed by the States-General whereas Source 2 was produced for a far narrower audience, the councillors of Amsterdam – it is likely that Source 2 had a greater long-term impact however</li> <li>• They agree that Philip was bound by some sort of 'social contract' with the Dutch people which was made at his coronation and he has violated, justifying continuing rebellion and his removal as monarch.</li> </ul>

## Section B: indicative content

### Option 2B.1: Luther and the German Reformation, c1555–1555

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether Luther's criticism of the sales of indulgences in 1517 was primarily responsible for the German Reformation.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that Luther's criticism of the sales of indulgences in 1517 was primarily responsible for the German Reformation should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Discontent with the state of the Church did not coalesce into a coherent and widespread demand for reform until after Luther's '95 Theses' were published</li><li>• Tetzel's stretching of Catholic doctrine in order to boost sales of indulgences in 1517 allowed Luther to develop a wide-ranging, popular attack on the authority of the papacy and key teachings of the Church</li><li>• That some of the money raised went towards the rebuilding of St Peter's caused deep resentment of the financial demands of the Church and ignited feeling against domination by Italians</li><li>• Luther's skills as a polemical writer triggered a national demand for reform – poorly-handled attempts to silence him merely escalated his challenge.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that there were other important causes of the German Reformation should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Luther's condemnation of indulgences may not have had the impact it did were it not for the depth of discontent with many other of the teachings and practices of the Church in Germany</li><li>• Deep-seated and long-standing anticlericalism can be evidenced by the persistent criticisms of Catholic teachings made by the humanists and popular attacks on other abuses like simony</li><li>• The growth of the German economy in the decades before 1517 led to the growth of an increasingly wealthy and literate population unwilling to accept without question the Church's leadership</li><li>• The lack of a strong, central political authority in the Empire meant that it was difficult to combat the spread of anticlerical ideas – it also allowed the Church to exploit Germany financially so stoking resentment</li><li>• The spread of printing was a significant contributory factor in disseminating new ideas.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about how significant the role of Philip Melanchthon was in the development of Lutheranism in the years 1521-46.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that Melanchthon's role was significant should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Melanchthon produced the <i>Loci Communes</i> in 1521, the first attempt to systemise Luther's ideas in one volume and a fundamental of Lutheran teaching</li> <li>• He played the leading part in drafting the Lutheran statement of faith, the Augsburg Confession, and assisted Luther in the German translation of the Bible</li> <li>• Melanchthon increasingly represented Luther in meetings at which he could not be present because of his Imperial Ban, e.g. at Augsburg and Regensburg</li> <li>• His skills as a diplomat and conciliator complemented Luther's more combative approach in discussion both with other reformers, notably Zwingli and Bucer, and with the Catholic authorities.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that Melanchthon's role was less significant in the development of Lutheranism in the years 1521-46 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Luther remained the charismatic founder of, and key inspiration for, Lutheranism – his skills as a popular preacher and writer contrasted with the more staid and scholarly Melanchthon</li> <li>• Luther continued to produce works of considerable influence including the German Mass of 1526 and the Catechisms of 1529</li> <li>• Though confined to Saxony by his Ban, Luther remained the ultimate arbiter for Protestants and his approval was still sought for Melanchthon's negotiations at Augsburg and Regensburg</li> <li>• The contribution of others, notably Bugenhagen and Bucer, may be considered as significant as Melanchthon's.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

**Option 2B.2: The Dutch Revolt, c1563-1609**

Question	Indicative content
5	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether the growth of Calvinism was more important than the actions of the Habsburg rulers in causing the outbreak of revolt in the Netherlands in 1567.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the growth of Calvinism was the most important factor in the outbreak of revolt should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Calvinism grew quickly in the 1560s and challenges to the religious authorities became more open and brazen despite the threat of the heresy laws and the activities of the Inquisition</li><li>• The spread of 'hedge preaching' drew large crowds throughout the Netherlands which the local authorities often either ignored for political reasons or lacked the resources to deal with</li><li>• The Iconoclastic Fury was a widespread and open affront to the Catholic faith of King Philip – it provoked a response from the authorities which helped precipitate revolt</li><li>• The demand for religious toleration aggravated the existing tensions between the Habsburgs and the Dutch over their traditional rights and privileges and thereby increased the chances of revolt.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the actions of the Habsburg rulers was the most important factor in the outbreak of the revolt of the Netherlands should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Philip was already unpopular as he had established a narrow and unrepresentative government under Margaret of Parma, widely perceived as 'foreign' and hostile to the established privileges of the Netherlands</li><li>• The reform of the bishoprics, itself an attempt to strengthen religious authority in order to combat the spread of heresy, only created further opposition</li><li>• Margaret was politically inexperienced and caught increasingly between the demands of the 'grandeers' and the 'Beggars' on the one hand, and the intransigence of Philip on the other</li><li>• Philip's unwillingness to compromise or negotiate, whether concerning the traditional rights of the provinces or the issue of religious toleration, made some sort of military action likely.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
6	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how accurate it is to say that the Duke of Alva was largely a success as governor-general of the Netherlands in the years 1567-73.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that Alva was largely a success as governor-general should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Though severe in method, Alva quickly secured Philip's authority in the Netherlands which had become increasingly shaky under Margaret</li> <li>• Orange's attempt at invasion in 1568 was repelled successfully at least in part because of Alva's determination to uphold royal authority combined with his military and organisational abilities</li> <li>• Alva had considerable support in the Netherlands for his staunch opposition to the growth of Calvinism – also his tax demands may be seen as justifiable given Philip's failure to finance his government properly</li> <li>• He completed the reform of the bishoprics (where Granvelle had failed), updated the criminal code and helped boost trade through Antwerp by simplifying customs dues.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that Alva was not largely a success as governor-general of the Netherlands should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alva lacked the diplomatic skills necessary to create permanent peace in the Netherlands and his policies were arguably counter-productive</li> <li>• His execution of Hoorn, Egmont and Brederode deeply alienated opinion, especially among the aristocracy, and renewed concerns about the imposition of Spanish absolutism in the Netherlands</li> <li>• The use of the Council of Troubles to restore religious orthodoxy created fear and resentment with Spanish rule while his tax demands led to widespread refusal and thereby, the collapse of the Dutch economy</li> <li>• Alva's reliance on oppression helped provoke Orange's second invasion in 1572 – after a series of military setbacks he was recalled with Holland and Zeeland in outright (and permanent) resistance to Spanish rule.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London, WC2R 0RL, United Kingdom